**THE HIGH COURT OF UTTARANCHAL AT NAINITAL**

(Court's order whether the case is or not approved for reporting

(Chapter VIII, Rule 32(2) (b)

Description of Case

Criminal Misc. Application No. 79 of 2001
(Old No. 1819 of 1994)

M/s Jamunado Mal

Versus

State & another

Date of decision :- 10.08.05

**A.F.R. (Approved for Reporting)**

Not approved for reporting

Date :- August 10, 2005. Initials of Judge

Note :- Bench Reader will attach this at the top of the first page of the Judgment when it is put up before the Judge for signature.

**HIGH COURT OF UTTARANCHAL AT NAINITAL.**

**Criminal Misc. Application No.79 of 2001**
**(Old No. 1819 of 1994)**

M/s Jamunado Mal
Kanudo Mal Oil & Flour Mill
Marwari Ganj, Bareilly
Through its partner
Sri Thakur Dass ……Applicant.

Vs.

1. State of Uttaranchal
2. Food Inspector
   Kanali Chheena
   Post Office KanaliChheena
   District Pithoragarh ……Respondents

**Hon'ble J. C. S. Rawat, J.**

Heard Sri Dharmendra Barthwal i/b for Sri Alok Singh learned senior counsel for the applicant and Sri G. S. Sandhu learned A.G.A.

**2.** The petition has been filed under section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (for short 'Code') to quash the proceedings in Criminal Case No.345/1984 State Vs. Uttam Singh & another under section 7/16 Prevention of Food Adulteration Act pending in the court of Chief Judicial Magistrate, Pithoragarh.

**3.** Brief allegations in the complaint lodged before the Magistrate concerned was that on 30.11.1983 the sample of mustard oil was alleged to have been taken by the food inspector from the shop of Uttam Singh. The sample was sent to the Public Analyst, Lucknow, U.P., who reported it to be adulterated. On the said complaint, the learned Magistrate passed the impugned order.

**4.** The learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the applicant has not issued any warranty and he could not be summoned under section 20(A) of the prevention of Food Adulteration Act 1954.

**5.** The learned counsel in support of his arguments has referred the decision in **M/s Chet Ram Parumal Oil Mill Vs. State of U.P. and another 1999(38) ACC p/938,** in which it has been held:-

> *"5. I have heard Mr. B.D. Mandhyan learned counsel for the applicant and learned A.G.A. Inspite of notices being served to the opposite party, no counter affidavit has been filled. The revision in pending since 7.12.1984 and about 14-1/2 years have elapsed. Learned counsel for the applicant contended that the name of the applicant was not disclosed by the vendor as required by section 14 of the Act. No copy of the notice was sent by the Food Inspector in accordance with the provisions of Section 13(2) of the Act. The learned counsel for the applicant also referred to Section 14 of the Act, which requires the manufacturer not to sell any article of food to any vendor unless he also gives a warranty in writing in the prescribed form about the nature and quality of such article to the vendor. Section 14 of the Act, further provides that the bill, cash memorandum or invoice given by the manufacturer shall be deemed to be a warranty given by such manufacturer. Learned counsel for the applicant contended that the applicant contended that the applicant had neither given any warranty nor any bill, cash memorandum or invoice to the vendor nor the Vendor had purchased the oil-tins from it, therefore, the applicant could not*

*be tried. It was next contended that by the learned counsel that in the absence of any evidence available on the record or collected by the Food Inspector, the applicant could not be summoned. The learned counsel also referred to Section 20-A of the Act which empowers the Magistrate to summon the manufacturer any stage of the trial if any evidence is adduced before him that the manufacturer is also concerned with the offence."*

**6.** The learned counsel in support of his arguments has also referred the decision in **Om Prakash Shivprakash Vs. K.I. Kuriakose SCC 1999 (8) p/633** in which it has been that the court has the power to implead the manufacturer, distributor or dealer under section 20-A of the Prevention of Food Adulteration Act and this power cannot be invoked before the stage of adducing the evidence in the trial. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has further clarified that the trial for the offences under the Act begins when the Magistrate asks the accused whether he pleads guilty or not as envisaged in section 251 of the Code. The evidence can be adduced only after recording the plea of the accused. Thus, the position is clear that power under section 20-A cannot be invoked before the stage of adducing evidence in the trial, nor can it be invoked after the conclusion of the trial.

**7.** The learned AGA conceded the position of facts and law as has been laid down under section 14 and 21 (A) of the Act.

**8.** In the instant case, the applicant had neither given any warranty nor any bill, cash memo or invoice to the

vendor nor the Vendor had purchased the oil from the applicant. In view of the above position of law and facts, the applicant is not liable to be tried at this stage.

**9.** In view of the foregoing discussion, I find that the Magistrate concerned has committed an error in summoning the applicant. Therefore, the proceedings in Criminal Case No.345/1984 State Vs. Uttam Singh & another under section 7/16 Prevention of Food Adulteration Act pending in the court of Chief Judicial Magistrate, Pithoragarh are quashed only against the applicant. So far as the proceeding against the other accused is concerned, the court below shall proceed against the other accused, if any. However, it is made clear that at any stage of the trial if any evidence is brought on record indicating that the applicant is concerned with the crime it shall be open to the court concerned to summon the applicant and proceed against him.

**10.** The petition is disposed of accordingly.

**(J. C. S. Rawat, J.)**

Dated 10.08.2005

LSR